DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 592 UD 023 195

AUTHOR Iadicola, Peter
TITLE Intellectual Models and School Policy: Desegregation as a Method of Assimilation.
PUB DATE Mar 80
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the North Central Sociological Association (Dayton, OH, March 1980).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Acculturation; Blacks; Desegregation Effects; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Intellectual History; Mexican Americans; *Minority Group Children; Racial Integration; Racial Segregation; School Desegregation

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses school desegregation as a method of assimilation (especially of blacks and Mexican-Americans) in the context of shifts in the intelligentsia and accompanying changes in national educational policy. Two general ideological positions have historically been in competition (1) the conservative/order model based on a belief in inherent racial superiority/inferiority and natural inequality, with separatist ideas leading to a national educational policy of segregation; and (2) the liberal/order position based on a belief in the cultural deprivation of minority groups, ethnocentrism, progressivism, and professional control, with assimilation/integration ideas leading to a national educational policy of desegregation. A third, minority position, the radical/conflict position, is based on belief in the preservation of cultural differences, minority-status groups, and community control, with ideas about cultural pluralism and cultural democracy leading to a desire for neighborhood schools and democratic localism; this position may soon challenge the now-dominant liberal/order position. A fourth alternative, based on belief in accommodation, freedom for assimilation, pluralism, and individual control, calls for a voucher system of education. (CMG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED237592

INTELLECTUAL MODELS AND SCHOOL POLICY: DESEGREGATION AS A METHOD OF ASSIMILATION

by

Peter Iadicola

Indiana University
Fort Wayne, Indiana

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Peter Iadicola

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- [x] This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- [ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

March 1980

Presented at 1980 North Central Sociological Association
Annual Meeting in Dayton, Ohio

UD 023195

Introduction

The sociology of knowledge points to the importance of viewing a society's world view, social knowledge, as relative to the composition of the intelligentsia whose official function it is to provide that interpretation. It is important to note in this context that the role of the intelligentsia is central in interpreting and defining social problems in terms of the dominant zeitgeist. Throughout history, philosophers and scholars of the emperor, king, president, etc., have directed state policy in matters of all importance. As the locus of power has shifted in government on specific domestic policies from the executive to the legislative, to the judicial branch, the intelligentsia has become more visible. Today more than ever before the social scientist has been called into the service of the different branches of government to give counsel.

Mannheim (1936) notes that in a relatively free intelligentsia, as opposed to the caste system of medieval society, members are increasingly recruited from different social strata and status group membership. Throughout the history of this country, one can note the changing composition of the intelligentsia in terms of social status group membership and corresponding world views. In general, Dahl (1961) identifies three stages of political development which manifests themselves in the changing distribution of power in society. He views the political evolution of a small community as a microcosm of the larger society. In a study of the city of New Haven he observed a shift in power from the rule of the patricians, to the rule of the entrepreneurial and the middle class, and finally to the rule of the

plebes or immigrant class. In describing the power relations within the community, he notes that "in the course of the past two centuries, New Haven has gradually changed from oligarchy to pluralism" (Dahl, 1961; p. 11). In recognition of this pattern of development of the political foundations of the community, the source of the intelligentsia in a community and the society as a whole is expected to have a parallel development. Indications of this pattern are present in a study by Faught which investigates the political ideology of Mexican Americans. Basically he finds that the educated Mexican American is critical of the social structure leaning more towards a Millsian and Marxian conception of power relations (Faught, 1978).

Ideological/Intellectual Positions

There are three general ideological/intellectual positions which have competed for dominance and which appear to represent those shifts in the locus of power in a society from aristocracy to rule of the immigrant classes. These positions will be presented in the form of ideal types: conservative/order, liberal/order, and radical/conflict.

Conservative/Order

The conservative/order assumes both a natural inequality between members of the society, and that humans are competitive by nature and act principally on self interest. The social system to operate efficiently must reflect these characteristics of people. The phenomenon of natural inequality is best reflected in the concept of intelligence as it is operationalized in I. Q. tests. Intelligence is generally viewed as a capacity to acquire skills and knowledge. The specific measures of intelligence provide information as to who are the predestined elite in the society. The inheritability of human intelligence is reflected in the social stratification system. Those who have reached the higher levels of success in the society as reflected in one's

position in the class structure, are more intelligent than those in the lower strata of the social structure, those who are not successful (Bowles and Gintis, 1972). Offspring will succeed parents in social position, not because of economic advantage or disadvantage, but rather, because of their inheritance of intellectual and cultural superiority or inferiority.

The social system is seen as an open arena where individuals compete for status and power. This contest, the meritocratic structure of the society, provides an order, or logic to the system of inequality that is based on the inheritability of a biological predisposition to success in the society. The meritocratic structure serves as the invisible hand which selects those who must take leadership positions in the social system and those who are to provide the maintenance functions of the social system if the society is to progress. The contest imagery serves as the basis for achievement in all social institutions and thus serves to essentially legitimate the stratification system in the society by providing a "scientific" foundation to the present power relationships. The conservative/order intellectual position reached its high point of acceptance in the doctrine of social darwinism of Spencer and others at the turn of the century which supported the rise of laissez faire capitalism.

Liberal/Order

The liberal/order position is fundamentally in agreement with the conservative/order position regarding the principal that there is a biological basis to the stratification order. However, it differs in its view of how much of an effect biological makeup actually has in determining the status and power of the individual. The liberal/order position views the mediating influence of social factors as of predominant importance in determining one's success in the social system. Factors such as: family

influence, primary socialization, proper schooling, and the influence of significant others are thought to explain more than the biological/inheritable factors.

However, like the conservative/order model, the assumptions of the liberal/order model revolves around the natural inequality between members of the society, the competitive nature of humans, and the predominant imagery of the meritocratic structure (contest) as functional to the social system. Unlike the conservative/order model, the liberal/order position recognizes some need for adjustment or fine tuning in the contest to make it operate as fairly and efficiently as possible. The concern for equal educational and economic opportunity reflects this position. Everyone must start at the same point as defined in terms of their opportunity to "win." The contest must be fair if the meritocratic structure of the social system is to be justified, and thus the current distribution of power in the society is to be legitimated.

The ideological/intellectual foundation of liberal/order doctrine follows from the rise of the middle class after the first world war. The reform movements (prohibition, child savers, settlement house, etc.) to uplift the poor and the culturally deprived were major concerns of this status group. Social policies of today such as Head Start, school desegregation, and comprehensive education programs arise out of this same ideological/intellectual position.

Radical/Conflict

The radical/conflict position recognizes historical status group differences between members of the society, not a natural state of inequality. The pluralist sees the source of these differences in a myriad of locations (cultural, religious, occupational, etc.) while the Marxist sees these differences fundamentally in the differing relationship to the means of production

in the society. For the Marxist and pluralist, members of the society are seen not as competitive by nature, but rather altruistic and communal. Inequality is essentially based on power differences, the foundation of which lie in the distribution of scarce resources and control over the means of production. Those groups who have control over wealth and its distribution serve to preserve their power and the power of their status group by passing on this control over the scarce resources to members of their own status group by means of the basic social institutions; economy, polity, family, and education.

The school is central to the meritocratic structure of the social system. For the radical/conflict theorist, the techniques of selecting "superior" students in the school are based on the correspondence between the values/knowledge of the school and the status group in power, thus serving to preserve the power of dominant groups. Unlike the two order models, there is no biological predisposition or "scientific" foundation to the stratification system other than that which is the result of the conflict between status groups. Those who have the power seek to preserve it, hence the continuity and stability of the distribution of wealth and the structure of the social order. For the Marxist, specifically, the system or inequality is not necessary for the progression of society. The contest is not fair according to the radical/conflict thesis. The results, the winners, are known before the participants begin to compete. The consistent relationships between individual background characteristics (socioeconomic status, education of head of household, and race) and school achievement is believed to attest to this function of the school. The contest is merely a facade to cover the societal institutions role in controlling less powerful groups and maintaining the dominant power relationships in the society.

The beginnings of a rise of the radical/conflict position follows from the extension of formal power to those who had been on the fringes of society, nonwhite ethnic

and union workers in general. The current systems of quotas and affirmative action programs find their basis in the radical/conflict model. Although at times they are purported to be liberal policies, the cry of reverse discrimination and the division among liberal intellectuals indicates the contradictions of these practices in terms of the liberal/order model's contest foundation.

Ideological/Intellectual Positions and Race Relations

It is important to note that in all three ideological/intellectual positions, the role of the school as either an agency which sorts out and educates the "intellectual" elite, or socializes the general population and provides equal opportunity for achievement in the contest, or serves to control the powerless, is a central institution in questions concerning inequality and a just social order. This is particularly the case in discussing how the three intellectual positions portray the problem of racial inequality. John Horton (1966) describes the two general opposing models of society: order and conflict as they differ on the race relations problem. Horton notes that the competition historically has been between the conservative and liberal/order intellectual positions.

Conservative/Order

The conservative/order position, which has been dominant in its representation in the intelligentsia at different periods in history in terms of the race issue, is based on the inheritable (genetic) differences between racial groups. The effects of socialization within the family and school will have little effect on minority group's social status in the society (Jensen, 1969; Hernstein, 1973). The race problem is primarily defined in terms of prejudice and discrimination. The elimination of this malady will allow the contest, the meritocracy to operate more efficiently in selecting out the "gifted" members of the minority populations. The racial problem is

one where the irrationality of prejudice and discrimination disrupts the contest. However, it is quite understandable why these minority populations do poorly in the contest. Fundamentally, these are populations which are biologically/intellectually inferior and thus cannot succeed in a fair contest.

Historically, the conservative position was heard in its opposition to Robert Dale Owen's proposal of public education for the working man, more emphatically, during the testing and eugenics movements at the turn of the century, and in laws which serve to segregate non-white minorities for educational purposes. Itzkoff refers to the conservative/order perspective as the Anglo Saxon Nationalist. The central concern is nativist in origins: fear of cultural and social contamination of the dominant population (Itzkoff, 1976). Authors such as Ulysses Weatherly, a president of the A.S.A., in two articles expressed concern about social and biological assimilation. Weatherly maintained that there was a natural organic aversion to biological assimilation, so that "stimulating and beneficient" traits and capacities could be retained; also social assimilation works well only with socially similar races according to Weatherly (in Pettigrew, 1980). Today, proponents of the conservative/order perspective are the defenders of the neighborhood school as a techique for segregated education and the validity of the IQ test for sorting students to provide the most "gifted" with the best resources to manifest their potential.

Liberal/Order

Contemporary liberalism has been dominant in more recent times as exhibited in social policy on the race question and inequality. Horton views a selective pattern of interpretation derived from the liberal/order model: "(a) the explanation of the problem as a moral dilemma and its solution as one requiring adjustment through socialization and social control, (b) the explanation of the minority group as a reaction formation to exclusion from middle class, (c) an emphasis on concepts useful in the explanation of order

(shared values as opposed to economic and political differences)" (Horton, 1966, p. 706). Horton considers an implicit equalitarianism in the liberal/order thesis. The Blacks low position and their inability to compete reflect both unequal opportunity (discrimination and prejudice) and inadequate socialization. "Thus, the liberal fate of minorities, including Negroes, is basically containment through socialization to dominant values" (Horton, 1966, p. 707). Much of the liberal/order perspective in race relations centers around the race relations model of Park (1950) and Bogardus (1931) and Parson's (1954) social integration model. "It is a condition of the stability of social systems that there should be an integration of the component units to constitute a common value system.

The school has been an important vehicle for the liberal/order intelligentsia for resolving the race problem; specifically in the case of blacks, however, also with other minority populations. The policy of desegregation is defined generally as a policy which is consistent with the liberal/order intellectual position that was directed toward the assimilation/resocialization of white European ethnic populations.

Beginning with the public school, the intent of the institution has been to control the socialization of minority students. It was not mere historical coincidence that America's public school system was established a few years after the first large wave of immigration in the 1850's. Indeed, it was in reaction to the large numbers of foreigners that public school systems were founded. The primary function of the institutionalized public school system was to assimilate the children of the newly arrived immigrants. A passage from the journal "The Massachusetts Teacher," October 1851, sets the historical framework.

> The constantly increasing influx of foreigners during the last ten years has been, and continues to be, a cause of serious alarm to the most intelligent of our own people. What will be the ultimate effect of this vast and unexampled immigration is a problem which has engaged the most anxious thought of our best and wisest men. Will it, like

> the muddy Missouri, as it pours its water into the clear Mississippi and contaminates the whole united mass, spread ignorance and vice, crime and disease, through our native population? Or can we by any process, not only preserve ourselves from the threatened demoralization, but improve and purify and make valuable this new element which is thus forced upon us which we cannot shut out (Katz, 1971b, p. 169).

The article continues on to note that the solution to the problem lies in the functioning of the public schools. Lawrence Cremin (1961) reports that Horace Mann, a leading proponent of the public school, was impressed with the diversity of the American people. However, he feared that conflicts of values might create deep divisions in the populace. The public schools were viewed as the unifying agent of the great mass of foreigners. It was their task to assimilate and to make one the people of this new nation.

Michael Katz (1971a) views the rise of the centralized public school system as stemming from an outright fear of cultural divisiveness which appeared inherent in the increasing religious and ethnic diversity of the population. He notes that "cultural homogenization" played counterpoint to administrative rationality in the creation of the public school.

Generally, there appears to be agreement among many education historians that the public school system was founded on an overwhelming concern about the immigration of foreigners into the urban centers of the nation. It was the fear of ethnic diversity that became the motivating factor in the establishment of a policy of universal education, which before long became a policy of compulsory education. Thus, universal education was a reactionary movement aimed at the foreign element, accomplished because of a concern over the influence of an "inferior" ethnic population rather than purely humanitarian concern. "In such a heterogeneous, quickly changing society, education became an instrument, deliberately used, by which dominant groups sought to recreate an ideal unity and minorities struggled to retain their group's identity and project it into the future" (Bailyn, 1960, p. 100). The Dutch schools in New York, during the colonial period, the German schools in Pennsylvania, and the member denominational schools were examples of status groups attempting to

preserve membership (Kilpatrick, 1912; Weber, 1905). Tyack notes Catholic dissenters opposed the common school precisely because they "treasured" cultural differences which public schoolmen were attempting to destroy (Tyack, 1974). The Pierce decision, along with other like decisions, served to preserve the group's right to maintain its membership in the face of assimilatory forces. However, it was a right for those who could afford to support two systems of education.

It was not until a second wave of immigration that the school's function of anglicizing the population was grounded explicitly in its institutional organization. A darker skinned immigrant had "invaded" our shores, not as dark or as stigmatized as blacks, Native Americans, or Mexican Americans, who were all separated from the dominant population as much as possible (Wollenberg, 1976), but nevertheless one that was viewed as somewhat impure. Paul C. Violas notes the importance of the change in the ethnic composition of the second immigrant wave. "What seemed most threatening was the radical shift in the source of immigration from Northern to Southern and Eastern Europe. The new immigrant, representing a cultural background much different from the old, was seen not only as a threat to the mores of America, but often as the cause of all problems in American society. Somehow the stranger in the land had to be changed if flux and chaos was to abate" (Karier, Violas, and Spring, 1973, p. 67).

What has become known as the Americanization movement was a reaction to this new breed of immigrant. Robert Carlson (1975) notes that between 1850 and 1920 there arose an educational campaign so intensive that Americanization education came to be associated in popular thought almost exclusively with the attempted indoctrination of Eastern and Southern European immigrants. The immigrant was offered a better position in life via the educational institution. In return, it was expected that he or she would repudiate his or her native culture and conform to the dominant society's pattern of dress and language and

would eventually adopt the "American civic religion."

Vocational education was introduced into many public schools to aid the immigrant in acquiring skills necessary to obtain work. What resulted was a new rigidity in the school system (Spring, 1972). Vocational education became the primary educational program for the majority of Eastern and Southern factories. The period was characterized by an intensified effort to assimilate the new breed of immigrant as quickly as possible before he or she "infected" the population. Tyack observed that "the creation of efficient and uniformed police paralleled the movement to standardize schooling in order to control the dangerous classes. Both were in part responses to the influx of the immigrant poor" (Tyack, 1974, p. 33). In 1921, the National Education Association organized a department of immigrant education. In that same year, an emergency quota system restricting immigration of Southern and Eastern Europeans was passed by the Congress of the United States. Meanwhile, many nonwhite ethnics were still segregated from the population.

During this same period, the progressive movement in education was under way. This movement in education and politics was partly based on the works of Cooley and Ross. Central to the system of thought of these theorists was the notion of the organic society. Jane Addams, a spokeswoman for the progressive movement in education and politics, viewed society as moving from an era of individualism to one of collective association. The fundamental characteristic of democracy for Addams was not individual freedom but rather the identification with the common lot, which is essential to democracy (Karier, Violas, and Spring, 1973). Jane Addams believed the individual must be stripped of all regional and ethnic identities to become fit for this new community. "The new immigrant for Jane Addams presented a threat because his different ethnic background disrupted American cultural unity. The relative ease, however, with which he could be stripped of his cultural foundations and reduced to the simplest common elements of humanity enhanced his value as a building block for her new

community" (Karier, Violas, and Spring, 1973, p. 73).

The liberal/order philosophy of John Dewey is often viewed as the ideological center for much of the progressive tradition. Dewey also viewed ethnic and religious differences as a threat to the survival of society which must be overcome through assimilation (Karier, Violas, and Spring, 1973). Throughout the progressive movement appears a concern with national unity and the assimilation of the immigrant. A result of the progressive era was the initiation of the movement of control of schools from local wards and neighborhoods to centralized boards. In other words, the power of the immigrant communities to pass on their native cultural tradition to their children was taken away in order to facilitate assimilation (Cohen and Averson, 1972; Tyack, 1974). Cubberly makes this point explicit: "One of the important results of the change from ward representation to election from the city at large, in any city of average decency and intelligence, is that the inevitable representation from these 'poor wards' is eliminated, and the board comes to partake of the best characteristics of the city as a whole" (Cubberly, 1916, p. 93). Tyack notes that, like religion, bilingualism and biculturalism aroused strong feelings in public school politics. Nativists and immigrants clashed swords over the issue in school board elections. The conflict was influential in the rise of the know-nothings, American Protection Association, which arose from the antiimmigrant feelings of the post-World War I era. The nativists demanded that the schools Americanize immigrants, not preserve differences (Tyack, 1974).

The movement from the development of public schools to the Americanization movement parallels the rise in power of the middle class and the liberal/order intelligentsia. During the progressive era, this intellectual model reached a high point of acceptance. The laissez faire doctrines of social Darwinism were on wane at the turn of the century. The liberal/order model was exhibited in the intellectual elite of the times and reached a high level of acceptance.

The post-World War II period was characterized by the competition in

technology between the Soviet Union and the United States, which had the effect of placing an emphasis on the testing and placement of children in instruction that would maximize their potential. Conservative intellectuals promoted the thesis that the nation has limited educational resources, and that those resources should be wisely spent on those individuals who would most benefit the society (Rickover, 1957, Conant, 1961). Segregationist policies of the conservative/order theorists were implanted within the schools in the form of systems of tracking and educational programs for the elite. The adoption of Conant's comprehensive high school was a system of streams all designed to efficiently place the individual in the occupation most suited to his or her abilities.

After the 50's cold war mentality, which supported the conservative/order stress on providing resources for the "Gifted," the liberal/order model gained renewed strength. During the 1960's, the civil rights movement, together with the war on poverty, place the spotlight on the problems of the minority population, and the rise again of the Liberal/Order model in order to stem the tide of growing dissent among minorities. The response was the initiation of programs to educate, to train and to uplift the "culturally" disadvantaged. The next major change in the nation's educational policy was engendered in this atmosphere. The stimulus for the change came from the 1954 Supreme Court decision, Brown v. Board of Education. The movement away from the continued segregation of the black American to a policy of integrating the black population received its legal basis from this landmark decision. In effect the decision made race an illegal critera of governmental action in both education and general affairs. However, to many liberals this was a negative approach to the problem of racial inequality. Itzkoff notes that the principle of integration became the more aggressive policy. Integration was a determined effort to bring the Black American into the mainstream of American middle class life (Itzkoff, 1976). Desegregation on a large scale did not begin until more than 10 years after this court decision. The Supreme

Court's decision exhibited the conflict between status groups (conservative/order vs. liberal/order) over the issue of segregation versus assimilation of those ethnic populations who had previously been excluded from the mainstream.

The intelligentsia played a significant role in determining the outcome. Footnote eleven of the brief submitted by the plaintiffs presented evidence of the psychological damage to black students of segregation (Clark, 1950). Additional evidence was also found in Deutscher and Chein's "The Psychological Effects of Enforced Segregation: A Survey of Social Science Opinion." "The opinions stated by a large majority (90%) of social scientists who replied to a questionnaire concerning the probable effects of enforced segregation under conditions of equal facilities is that regardless of the facilities which are provided, enforced segregation is psychologically detrimental to the members of the segregated group" (Kirp and Yudorf, 1974, p. 297).

Some legal experts feel that footnote eleven was essentially unimportant to the judicial decision. Yudorf comments that the court decision was based more on an ethical standard, as opposed to "scientific" evidence, although the central point of the brief submitted by the plaintiffs appears to be dependent on "scientific" evidence and not so much on an ethical argument. "We come then to the question presented: Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other tangible factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? . . . Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of Plessy v. Fergurson, this finding is amply supported by modern authority" (347 U. S. 483, 1954). In support of his conclusion, Yudorf notes that "the courts have not allowed school boards or white interveners to introduce social science data and testimony to contradict the Brown result. They have simply not been interested in proof suggesting that integration is injurious or that segregation is not harmful" (Kirp and Yudorf, 1974, p. 299). From the conflict model, one could make the argument

that status groups supportive of the liberal/order intellectual position were in control of the courts. The Brown decision indicated that the battle had been won. Refusing to allow discrepant testimony of intellectuals representing the opposing intellectual position served to seal the victory.

The nature of the remedy prescribed by the court is also inconsistent with the standard ethical argument. Bickel notes that the "normal" and expected judgment of the court is a crisp and scientific writing which tells each party, or one of the parties, exactly what he must do. "The equivalent in these cases would have been a decree ordering the named children, and perhaps, since these were class actions, all children in the five school districts affected who were similarly situated, to be admitted forthwith to the white school of their choice" (in Kirp and Yudorf, 1974, p. 305). In such a decision, the individual or group of individuals would have the choice of action. The court's decision as established by Brown II, however, was to place the matter in the hands of the local courts and school boards. The reason noted for the decision was the delicate political nature of the situation. The phrase "with all deliberate speed," as opposed to a statement noting a specific time interval, testifies to the court's concern over the matter. However, the approach prescribed by the court took the power of discretion as to which schools the students should be placed out of the individual student's hands. It appeared that minorities, specifically blacks, were to be integrated for their own good, whether they were in favor of it or not. While Bickel's example of a ruling would appear to be more in line with the ethical standard argument of Yudorf, the actual ruling handed down by Brown II would seem to be more in line with the scientific proof of psychological damage.

The decision made in Brown II expresses a concern for psychological damage and the need for assimilation/integration of the population rather than a concern for fairness or justice alone. Voluntary desegregation programs were seen as obstructing the cause of desegregation, yet these voluntary programs would be more in line with the decree that the state may not treat blacks

differently from whites in the operation of the public schools merely because of their race. Pupil placement laws which allowed for free transfer of students were techniques often used by status groups representing the conservative/order position, the intellectual "opposition," to preserve segregation. The case of Mobile, Alabama, is a good example of this. After formally desegregating, the school district would grant to any students who constituted a racial minority in their school the option of transferring back to their old school in which their race was the majority (Kirp and Yudorf, 1974). In Goss v. Board of Education (373 U. S. 683, 1963), the Supreme Court struck down such plans as in violation of Brown. "Here the right of transfer, which operates solely on the basis of racial classification, is a one-way ticket leading to one destination, i.e., the majority race of the transferee and continued segregation" (373 U. S. 687, 1963).

Historically, the conflict over desegregation is defined as between segregationist (conservative/order) and integrationist (liberal/order). Other status groups concerned with control over and function of the educational institution were not powerful enough to express their interest in the conflict. Issues regarding community control and comprehensive education were viewed as a part of a "racist" strategy to obstruct the desegregation policy. Researchers who presented findings which were damaging to the cause of desegregation were viewed as unethical as in the case of James Coleman and the controversy arising over white flight (Lee, 1976; Coleman 1976; Whyte, 1976).
David Armor's critique of the busing research quickly came under attack from mainstream liberal social scientists (Armor, 1972, Itzkoff, 1976). Under more recent attack from both conservative/order and radical/conflict theorists, the liberal/order position has hardened into defining quality education as synonymous with integrated education (Rist, 1976).

Other Supreme Court decisions and legislation were handed down dealing with discrimination against blacks in the areas of hiring, housing, and use of recreational facilities. The Black American was given the legal right to live next door to the white, to work in the same place, to recreate at the same

facility, and to attend school with the white. Before the drive for racial integregation, schooling for Black children was intentionally programmed to help them accept their place in the segregated American society, an expression of the conservative/order intellectual position. Now that Black Americans were to be integrated into white society, the goals of the educational institution had to be changed. The Blacks had to be "elevated" to white middle class standards in their language, their mannerisms, their dress, and, finally, their values. If they were to be accepted and if they were to succeed in the contest, they must become anglicized like the scores of immigrants who had been integrated into society before them. Stuart Alsop, a well-known and respected columnist, succinctly expresses the liberal/order position in a 1968 magazine column: "An enormous educational effort starting as early as the second year of life will have to be made if the children of the Negro immigrants, like the children of other immigrants before them, are to become Americans first, and Afro-Americans only second" (1968, p. 92).

The term "culturally deprived child" best describes the ethnocentric position of the liberal/order intelligentsia.

> Explicit in the concept that some children are culturally deprived is the idea that certain nurturing cultures do not provide the necessary influences to make children successful in school or acceptable in the majority society. The concept implies that the principal role of the school is to act as the first chain of influences that cause disadvantaged children to accept middle class culture, that is, the school's function in society is to reeducate the culturally distinct, both the poor and the foreign (Carter, 1970, p. 36).

In 1961, former Harvard University President James Conant recommended improved schooling for the black child to overcome the "adverse" influence of the home and the street. Busing black students to schools outside the slums to bring them in contact with white classmates was the method recommended to prepare them for entrance into middle class society and to motivate them to discard their black and lower class culture (in Carlson, 1975, p. 136). Desegregation was viewed by social scientists and liberal minded educators as the best method of assimilating this population. Iannacone notes that by

deciding that seperate is not equal, the court took a position consistent with the unitary community view, an assimilationist position. The decision carried the doctrine of progressivism to its inevitable end (Iannacone, 1977).

Mexican American integration into the dominant society followed the Black precedent. On June 4, 1970, a federal district court ruled that Mexican Americans are an identifiable ethnic minority group for the purpose of public school desegregation (Cisneros v. Corpus Christi Independent School District). Mexican Americans were entitled to the same protection afforded Blacks under Brown v. Board of Education (Kirp and Yudorf, 1974).

To recapitulate, the movement toward the integration of these ethnic groups, which have long been excluded from American society, resulted in the need for their intensive Americanization so that they, too, would not be able to disrupt the dominant society. Desegregated schools provided the opportunity for a comprehensive plan of assimilation. Educators and social scientists saw minority children as culturally deprived. By bringing them into contact with the white student, they would acquire the cultural disposition needed to reap the benefits of an equal education. In other words, they would become assimilated into the dominant society by means of contact with Anglo peers and in this way be able to achieve more equalized educational outcomes and consequently have an equal opportunity to succeed in society (Gerard and Miller, 1975).

Much research has been done noting the class and racial biases of the present educational system. Status attainment research illustrates the importance of the parents' education and socioeconomic status in the achievement of the elementary and secondary school student (Duncan, Featherman, and Duncan, 1972; Sewell and Shah, 1967; Haller and Portes, 1973). It has been shown that those with Anglo, middle class backgrounds achieve higher levels of success in the system than their non-Anglo and/or lower class peers (Hollingshead, 1949; Duncan, Featherman, and Duncan, 1972; Blau and Duncan, 1967). Therefore, the logic of the liberal/order model follows that the children of Black and Mexican-American

background must become like the Anglo middle class, so that they also may reap the benefits of an equal educational opportunity. They must obtain the culture of which they had been deprived by the segregated school and their culturally inferior home life. It is interesting to note that Collins views these same findings in terms of supporting the conflict model's contention that education has been used as a means of cultural selection (Collins, 1971).

The Black or Mexican-American child placed in an environment in which he is in a minority position, powerless, dependent on the reinforcement of Anglo peers and a teacher who is representative of the dominant society, dominant status groups, is expected to relinquish the ways of his family and adopt those of the dominant society. The individual child is expected to conform to the expectations of his newly adquired reference group, his Anglo peers. The teacher actively enculturates the minority group child in terms of the sub-culture of the dominant status groups by means of a comprehensive schooling program and also by serving as a model for individual behavior (Iadicola, 1977).

The same concern over cultural heterogeneity and the threat to the social order of earlier immigrant populations is expressed in the Kerner commission report on civil disorders. "This is our basic conclusion: our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white - seperate and unequal, reaction to last summers disorders has quickened the movement and deepened the division. Discrimination and segregation have long permeated much of American life; this now threatens the future of every American" (National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968: p. 1). According to Itzkoff, the integrationist today stress the equality and brotherhood of man, the necessity for disregarding social and cultural differences, and the need for unity, arguments similar to those advanced in the older assimilationist traditions (Itzkoff, 1974).

Radical/Conflict

Horton notes that the conflict intellectual position is a minority

interpretation by definition. The model is not represented in the zeitgeist of the society for it serves to remove the "scientific" justification for the social order. Horton further observes that the emerging cultural pluralism model which often appears in today's social policies has never meant the coexistence of culturally different groups. Rather, this liberal interpretation of pluralism, like liberal equalitarianism, allows differences only within a consensual framework (Horton, 1966). The conflict variety of pluralism as represented in the race relations literature (Furnival, 1948; Smith, 1960) is quite distinguishable from the liberal/order variety (Gordon, 1961).

There are two radical/conflict position in the literature; cultural pluralist and Marxist. Kallen (1924) represents the early cultural pluralist position. Kallen contends that democracy implies the right of "newcommers" to retain the ethnic and cultural affiliation of their choice. Kallen felt that cultural pluralism was the natural state of the social system and the movement toward the homogenization of cultural traditions serves to uproot the individual and destroy the basis for community. The true nature of this imposed assimilation is repression, a repression which is bound to fail according to Kallen. Kallen maintained that the Americanization movement was basically an anti-democratic assault on the rights of the individual.

Itzkoff (1974, 1976) presents the modern day cultural pluralist position. Itzkoff contends that the movement toward the elimination of cultural differences and the creation of a mass society has resulted in an alienating social environment in which individuals have little control over their social world, and where the system of social constraints have failed. "It is only when the impersonal state dissolves these cultural censors that man can be persuaded to commit the bestial acts that we have seen occur during history. For the general malaise of alienation, immorality, and despair, the only solution is the humane one, participation as an individual in a community where one can find a sense of identity, a belief in a shared set of values" (Itzkoff, 1974: p. 109). Itzkoff contends

that there are only a few cultural minorities among us. Today, like the ethnic minorities at the turn of the century, they are being coerced into giving up their cultural system to participate in the meritocratic contest. Itzkoff proposes that to have a free and equal society we must provide for "cultural democracy", a social structure that allows real personal and community freedom. Pluralism will develop naturally in the social system as a result of this freedom. This pluralism will counter the alienating forces of the mass society.

The marxist perspective views racial conflict as a special case of class conflict. Bonacich's work on the split labor market is representative of this perspective (Bonacich, 1976). She notes that minority populations, specifically, Blacks, have filled the ranks of surplus labor. In this position they are used by capital to divide the working force in order to maintain cheaper labor costs.

The conflict position, in general, recognizes the competition between status groups as an inevitable feature of any social system. Thus racial/ethnic relations are seen by their very nature as a conflict situation where the dominant Anglo population is attempting to control culturally divergent populations. The marxist position would define the conflict groups more in line with their relationship to means of production. A policy which attempts to eliminate and control different cultural status groups through assimilation and colonization is a strategy in this conflict. It is realized that control of the institutions of socialization is of central importance for preserving status group membership and power. Collins notes that the main activity of the school is to teach particular status cultures, both in and outside the classroom. "Insofar as a particular status group controls education, it may use it to foster control within work organization. Educational requirements for employment can serve both to select new members for elite positions who share the elite culture and, at a lower level of education, to hire lower and middle employees who have acquired a general respect for these elite values and styles" (Collins, 1971, p. 1007).

Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) describe schooling in terms of a part of a larger model of "symbolic violence." The first axiom of their theory defines symbolic violence as "every power which manages to impose meanings and to impose them as legitimate by concealing their power relations which are the basis of its force, adds its own specifically symbolic force to those relations" (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977; p. 4). In Bourdieu and Passeron's model, the educational system is viewed as that mechanism by which the power of dominant status groups is legitimated and preserved through symbolic violence. In the American society the educational institution serves to transmit the dominant ideology of individualism, the just contest, the ideal of freedom, and the idea of a general superiority of one cultural system over another. This ideology defined as knowledge is a powerful instrument for preserving the dominant power relationships in the society, and preserving the capitalist economic structure and the meritocratic social structure.

A recent work by Persell (1977) attempts to delineate the processes operating within the school which serve to sort and socialize students on the basis of status group membership. Iadicola (1979) discusses how two general dimensions of school control factors: (1) power relations factors (student, parent, and staff power differences) and (2) differentiating/ ranking factors (levels of norm referenced testing, classroom competition, classroom grouping, and differences in school busing) effect status differences between Anglo and minority students, and how this in turn generates passivity and the control of minority populations.

Bowles and Gintis, in a more Marxian orientation, view the selection process in the school functioning to replicate the occupational structure. Specifically, Bowles and Gintis (1976) discuss the role of the school in channeling students education on the basis of their personality characteristics which are based on their primary socialization. In another conflict model, Carnoy applies the internal colonialism model to the case of education of

Blacks and working class students (Carnoy, 1974). Blacks and the working class do not control school use or curriculum content, schooling has but one function, socioeconomic allocation in the interest of producing surplus for the capitalist class. According to Carnoy, schools were set up to teach proper behavior relating to work and the state, imputes needs for consumer goods, and work skills for factory production. Schooling as social control and economic allocation is colonialism.

Nevertheless, whether the problem is defined in terms of either cultural imperialism, colonization, or symbolic violence, the solution proposed by the radical/conflict perspective involves the democratization of control of the basic institutions of socialization and social control. Andrews critique of the racist assumptions of desegregation presents this alternative:

> Everybody believes blacks are inferior, the only real disagreement is over why--environment say the liberals; genetics say the Schockleys; evil, lazy, shiftless natures say the conservatives; and the left is caught on the horns of an ideological dilemma. The implications of these views are similarly racist. Most seem to agree that the result of blacks remaining with other blacks in their own schools equals mixing ignorance with ignorance. . . . The solution for blacks is community control. (Andrews, 1974; 40)

The radical/conflict perspective views desegregation as a step toward the assimilation and control of, specifically, the Black and Mexican-American population, to prepare them for integration into the dominant society and to select out those who possess a value orientation/knowledge consistent with the dominant status group to fill valued positions in society. In this way, the policy's goal is to convert and co-opt those who may be members of status groups which are competitive with the dominant group through differential socialization. Those who do not qualify, who are unable to be converted, will be left to fill relatively powerless positions in society, however, in the process defusing the conflict situation. Thus, desegregation can be viewed as one part of a general liberal/order policy to control powerless status groups through "proper" socialization.

Recently some ethnic communities have reacted against the policy of forced assimilation and their loss of control over the school. The Black nationalist movement was an explicit rejection of the integration thesis. Itzkoff (1974) notes that at present it is only a reaction of frustration and rage against the dominant society. Itzkoff notes however that the Black power movement has become the only meaningful expression of the Black condition. The opposing Black and white liberals hope that in time they will be able to bring the Black masses into the middle class via government intervention. Hamilton (1968) questions the liberal/order model and discusses the growing demand within the Black community for increased community controls as a means of cultural preservation. Hamilton notes that groups such as the National Association of Afro-American Educators, Harlem chapter of C.C.R.E., and Concerned Black Parent Groups in Chicago are calling for more cultural representation in the school.

Other reactions opposing the liberal/order thesis have come at times of intense conflict over desegregation. Over ninety five percent of the Asian Americans in San Francisco's Chinatown district in 1971 boycotted the school (Jung, 1972). Asian-American parents expressed concern about their children being unable to attend afterschool Chinese language schools if they were bused long distances for racial balance. Over 1,500 Chinese-American students attended four private "freedom schools" while on boycott (Newsweek, 1971). At the next citywide election for school board, a Chinese American opposed to the busing plan was appointed by the mayor. His appointment was confirmed in the citywide election. In mid-November, two-thirds of the Chinese-American students returned to classes. However, their concern about forced busing and effects on efforts to preserve their status group membership was expressed.

There has also been reaction from the Mexican-American community over assimilationist policies. In the case of Riverside, California, the strongest

opposition to desegregation came from the Mexican-American community. The elementary school in the Casa Blanca section of Riverside was the center of the Mexican-American community. It served the community as a school as well as an intermediary for relations with the outside community. "More than a school, it seemed almost as a kind of white American consulate to the people of Casa Blanca" (Hendrick, 1968, p. 41). The push for desegregation in Riverside came principally from the black community. Black students, at the time of desegregation, composed 6.5 percent of the schools' enrollment, while Mexican-American students composed 10.7 percent. Those Mexican-American leaders involved in the boycott efforts were predominantly from outside the Casa Blanca community. Hendrick observed that "there was a real problem of support for integration among the Mexican Americans in a community already possessing a clear cultural identity" (Hendrick, 1968, p. 146). Petitions within the Casa Blanca community were circulated by Mexican-American parents in opposition to the closing of the community school. Both petitions, together, produced about 190 signatures, mostly from the parents of at least 300 children attending Casa Blanca Elementary School.

The school board appointed a committee of Mexican-American and Black parents to work out the problems of integrating the students from the Casa Blanca school. Closing of the school was not the issue. It had already been decided that the school was to be closed. The Casa Blanca community appeared relatively powerless; the momentum was against them. The leader and spokesman of the community, the principal of the school, was powerless to act. Middle class Mexican-American elites from outside the community, together with middle class black leaders and the school board, appeared to be in control of the politics of the situation. There was little organized opposition from the Anglo community. One year after desegregation had been started in Riverside, Casa Blanca Elementary School was closed.

Rise of the Radical/Conflict Model

The Mexican-American community expressed its dissatisfaction with desegregation one last time during the special election in 1966 for the tax override to finance school costs. The tax override proposition lost miserably, 42 percent in favor, 58 percent opposed. Casa Blanca, the largest Mexican-American community in the city, and the Lowell district, which contains the second largest Mexican-American school population, turned down the tax override, with 38 percent and 48 percent positive votes, respectively. The tax override passed the second time, in 1967, with a vote of 50.7 percent in favor. The Casa Blanca district voted in favor of the override this time. However, during the 1966 election, 505 votes were cast. In 1967, only 231 votes were cast from the two precincts embracing Casa Blanca and parts of the Washington attendance area (Hendrick, 1968). Hendrick feels that the most apparent reason for the low turnout was that the Mexican-American population in Casa Blanca in 1966 were in a quiet wax expressing displeasure over the closing of Casa Blanca school. Those still opposed to the closing were not motivated to strike another retaliatory blow at the school district (Hendrick, 1968).

In other communities, there have been demands from Mexican-American student groups for more Mexican cultural representation in the curriculum and staffing of the school. In Los Angeles in 1968, 12,000 students in five predominantly Mexican-American high schools called a boycott to protest just this cultural exclusion from their school (Weinberg, 1977). Smith and Foley (1978) discuss a case of a small town in Texas, Aztlan City, population 10,000. A radical faction of the Mexican-American student body gained control of the schools through boycotts and political action in the city council. Smith and Foley note that once Mayo-Cu control was established, the goals of the school were changed. "Cultural transmissions through new curriculum, classroom and community activities, cocurricular events, and a comprehensive new philosophy of bilingual/bicultural education were to create a new social being--a 'chicano

view' of the self and society" (Smith and Foley, 1978, p. 158). The political factions in the Mexican-American community represented both the conflict and the liberal order intellectual positions. The liberal order faction viewed acculturation and assimilation as necessary and desirable in order to attain full citizenship rights and economic opportunities. The conflict position viewed the liberal order faction as proposing the continuation of a policy of colonization of the Mexican-American community by the dominant Anglo society.

The conflict exhibited in the Asian community in San Francisco and the Mexican-American communities in Riverside, Aztlan City, and Los Angeles may be an indication of the growing strength of the ethnic communities who had been segregated from the mainstream, and their resistance to policies of assimilation. Resistance to the liberal/order policies may be an indication of competition from the third intellectual model. Figure 1 summarizes major historical trends in educational policies toward Black and Mexican-American children, in addition

- - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Figure 1 here

- - - - - - - - - - -

to their intellectual and ideological foundations. Segregation as an educational policy founded on the conservative/order model is phasing out. This model most closely represents the internal colonialism model (Carnoy, 1974). Minority students would be isolated, however, control over the educational institution would be in the hands of the dominant group. The desegregation policy is consistent with the liberal/order model and is more or less the present educational policy. It is an attempt to further legitimate the contest model of the social system by making the contest "fair" by providing "equal opportunity." However, in order to succeed in the contest the participants must become culturally like those who control the game (who define the knowledge and the rules to attain and assess it).

The third possible development, yet to be realized, is cultural democracy or pluralism based on the radical/conflict model. The latter formulation would be similar to Katz's concept of "democratic localism" a return to complete community control over the school (Katz, 1971a). Decisions regarding curriculum, organization of the school, etc., would be made directly by the people in the community. Thus, control over the selecting and sorting processes in the school will be in the hands of the individuals who have been victimized by this process. However, for the radical/conflict model control over the educational institution is only one step toward gaining control over their lives in the other social arenas (polity and economy). Equality of resources, both political and economic, are implied in this model. Alport's (1954) concept of "accommodation" encompasses the last policy alternative. It is a policy of freedom of choice for the individual parent. Parent choices would be realized by means of the institutionalization of the voucher system of some sort, where the individual parents directly purchase the specific instruction or skills that were deemed necessary. This practice would encourage an atmosphere of multicultural coexistence where there would be freedom for both assimilation and cultural pluralism to occur according to the needs of the minority group itself. The last policy alternative has been promoted by conservatives such as Friedman (1962) and Coons and Sugarman (1978). It has generally been rejected by radicals for it is based on individual competition and extension of the contest model. Nevertheless, beginning with the policy of democratic localism, the voucher system would be the final step in a decentralized system of public education and the individual's control over socialization.

Conclusion

As there are shifts in the composition of the intelligentsia, there are changes in the conflicting policy alternatives. Regarding the question of race relations, there have been changes in the definition of the problem and the

solution proposed. It appears that in the last sixty years the intelligentsia purporting the liberal/order model has become dominant. Since the institutionalization of the public schools, education has been directed toward controlling elements in society by means of socialization and sorting functions. Today, the turn-of-the-century Americanization movement has its parallel development in the current desegregation policy. Cubberly, a spokesman for the liberal/order position at this early period in schools' historical development, noted that the first task of education "was to break up their ghettos, to assimilate, to implant in their children, so far as can be done, the Anglo-Saxon conceptions of righteousness, law and order, and popular government and to awaken in them a reverence for our democratic institutions and for those things in our national life which we as a people hold to be of abiding worth" (Cubberly, 1916, p. 101). The statements by Conant and Alsop are both representative of the modern-day liberal/order position on education and are very similar in content.

The competing radical/conflict model challenges the role of education as a means to control minority population through socialization. Aron observes that the right of parents to pass on their culture and values to their children is a negative constitutional right. Those who wish to exercise this right must sacrifice the right to attend state-sponsored education and, therefore, must subsidize both the private schools as well as public schools (Aron, 1976). John Stuart Mill wrote, in his essay on liberty a century ago, that "state-sponsored education is a mere continuance for molding people to be exactly like one another, and as the mold in which it casts them is that which pleases the predominant power in the government, whether this be a monarch, a priesthood, an aristocracy, or the majority of the existing generation, in proportion as it is efficient and successful, it establishes a despotism over the mind" (Mill, 1859, pp. 190-91).

Arnove and Strout conclude an article on alternative schooling and cultural pluralism, noting that "as to whose values shall constitute the basis of consensus, the creation and running of a school system, like any other major social institution, involves the exercise of power. And schools are likely to be shaped by social groups to the extent that they possess and exercise power in society" (Arnove and Strout, 1978, p. 92). The Supreme Court ruling that separate schools do not provide equal educational opportunity was interpreted broadly to reaffirm the Anglo-conformity assimilationist position of the liberal/order intelligentsia.

Desegregation is consistent with this doctrine and by its very nature denies the individual a choice as to whether he wishes to be assimilated or not, denies the establishment of cultural pluralism or cultural democracy. An example of this is the case of the alternate public schools, Black House and Casa de la Raza, established to preserve cultural differences in the Berkely, California community. These schools encountered difficulties when Senator McClelland, a member of the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, requested the HEW Office of Civil Rights to investigate the schools for violation of Title VI of the 1964 civil rights act which prohibits racial discrimination in federally funded programs (Arnove and Strout, 1978). Conflict over racial policy in the future will certainly center arourd the Brown ruling. The question will be; is seperate "inherently" unequal? Given the continuing circulation of members of the intelligentsia that Manheim noted, together with a growing mobilization of power within ethnic communities concerned about cultural/status group preservation, a new challenge to the liberal/order intelligentsia from the radical/conflict position may soon come about. However, unless the distribution of power dramatically changes in the society as a whole in all institutional arenas, these challengers may become co-opted by the dominant group after making some relatively modest gains in cultural preservation in the educational arena.

References

Allport, Gordon W.

1954 The nature of prejudice. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Alsop, Stewart.

1968 The anti-honky war. Newsweek, December 16, 1968, p. 116.

Andrews, Malachi.

1974 "The Racist Assumptions of Busing". Ramparts Vol. 13 (December) 38-40.

Armor, David J.

1972 The Evidence on Busing. Public Interest Vol. 28 (Summer) pp. 90-126.

Arnove, Robert and Toby Strout.

1978 Alternative schools and cultural pluralism: Promise and reality. Educational Research Quarterly, 2(2), 89-108).

Bailyn, Bernard.

1960 Education in the forming of American society. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960.

Blau, Peter M. and Otis Dudley Duncan.

1967 The American occupational structure. New York: John Wiley.

Bogardus, Emory S.

1932 A Race Relations Cycle. American Journal of Sociology vol. 36: pp 612-617.

Bonacich, Edna

1976 Advanced Capitalism and Black/White Race Relations in the United States: a Split Labor Market Interpretation. American Sociological Association vol. 41 pp. 34-51.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron.

1977 Reproduction in education, society, and culture. Sage Publications: Beverly Hills.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis.

1976 Schooling in Capitalist Society. New York: Basic Books.

Brown v. Board of Education (347 U.S. 483, 1954).

Carlson, Robert A.

1975 The quest for conformity: Americanization through education. New York: John Wiley.

Carnoy, Martin.

1974 Education as Cultural Imperialism. New York: David McKay.

Carter, Thomas P.

1970 Mexican Americans in school: A history of educational neglect. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Clark, Kenneth B.

1950 Effects of prejudice and discrimination on personality development. Paper presented at the Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth, Washington, D.C.

Cohen, David K. and Averson, Marvin.

1972 Education and the corporate order. Socialist Revolution 2(2), 47-72.

Coleman, James.

1976 "Letters" Footnotes, vol. 4, no. 8, p. 4.

Collins, Randall.

1971 Functional and conflict theories of educational stratification. American Sociological Review, 36, 1002-19.

Conant, James

1961 Slums and Suburbs. New York: McGraw Hill.

Coons, John E. and Stephan D. Sugarman.

1978 Education by Choice. University of California Press.

Cremin, Lawrence A.

1961 The transformation of the school. New York: Vintage Books.

Cubberly, Ellwood P.

1916 Public school administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916.

Dahl, Robert A.

1961 Who govern: Democracy and power in an American city. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Duncan, Otis Dudley, David Featherman and Beverly Duncan.

1972 Socioeconomic background and achievement. New York: Seminar Press.

Farrington v. Tokushige (273 U.S. 284, 1926).

Faught, Jim D.

1978 Stratification and Political Ideology of Mexican Americans. Western Sociological Review 9 No. 1, pp. 1-11.

Friedman, Milton

1962 Capitalism and Freedom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Furnival, John S.

1948 Colonial policy and practice. London: Cambridge University Press.

Gerard, Harold B. and Norman Miller.

1975 School Desegregation; a long term study. New York: Phenum Press.

Gordon, Milton.

1961 Assimilation in American life. New York: Oxford University Press.

Goss v. Board of Education (373 U.S. 683, 687, 1963).

Greer, Colin.

1972 The great school legend. New York: Basic Books.

Haller, Archibald O. and Alejandro Portes.

1973 Status attainment process. Sociology of Education 46(winter), 59-91.

Hamilton, Charles V.

1968 Race and Education: A Search for Legitimacy. Harvard Educational Review vol. 38, no. 4 (Fall) pp. 669-684.

Hendrick, Irving.

1968 The development of a school integration plan in Riverside California: A history and perspective. Riverside: University of California.

Hernstein, R. J.

1973 I.Q. in the Meritocracy. Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press.

Horton, John.

1966 Order and conflict theories of social problems as competing ideologies. American Journal of Sociology 71(May), 701-13.

Iadicola, Peter

1979 Schooling and Social Control: A Presentation of a Weberian Conflict Model of the School. Doctoral Dissertation: University of California, Riverside.

Iannacone, Lawrence.

1977 In the politics of education. Edited by Jay D. Scribner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Itzkoff, Seymour W.

1974 Cultural Pluralism and American Education. Scranton: International Textbook.

1976 A New Public Education. New York: David McKay Company

Jensen, Arthur R.

1969 "How Much Can We Boost I.Q. and Scholastic Achievement?" Harvard Education Review, 39, p. 181.

Jung, Raymond K.

1972 The Chinese language school in the U.S. School and Society 100(2342), 304-305.

Kallen, Horace

1924 Culture and Democracy in the United States. New York: Boni and Liveright.

Karabel, Jerome and A. H. Halsey.

1977 Power and ideology in education. New York: Oxford University Press.

Karier, Clarence J., Paul Violas and Joel Spring.

1973 Roots of crisis: American education in the twentieth century. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Katz, Michael B.

1971a Class, bureacracy, and schools. New York: Praeger.

1971b School reform: Past and present. Boston: Little Brown.

Kilpatrick, William H.

1912 The Dutch schools of New Netherlands and colonial New York. Washington, D.C.

Kirp, David L. and Mark G. Yudorf

1974 Educational policy and the law. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing.

Krickus, Richard.

1976 Pursuing the American dream. Garden City: Anchor Books.

Lee, Alfred McClung.

1976a "Valedictory: A Report on the Year 1975-1976" Footnotes 4:6.

Mannheim, Karl.

1936. Ideology and utopia. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Mercer, Jane R.

1976 Test "validity," "bias," and "fairness": An analysis from the perspective of the sociology of knowledge. Manuscript submitted for publication

Merton, Robert K.

1968 Social Theory and Social Structure. MacMillan Publishing Co., New York.

Mill, John Stuart.

1859 On liberty. London: John W. Parker and Son.

Newsweek

1971 78(12), 43. September 27. "San Francisco: Boycotting the Buses."

Park, Robert E.

1950 Race and Culture. Glencoe: Free Press

Persell, Caroline H.

1977 Equality and inequality: A theoretical synthesis. New York: The Free Press.

Rickover, Hyman G.

1957 Education and Freedom. New York: Dutton and Co.

Sewell, William H. and Vimal P. Shah.

1967 Socioeconomic status, intelligence, and attainment of higher education. Sociology of Education, 40, 1-23.

Smith, M. G.

1960 Social and cultural pluralism. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 85, part 5, 763-85.

Smith, W. Elwood and Douglas E. Foley.

1978 Mexicano resistance to schooling in a south Texas colony. Education and Urban Society, 19(2).

Spring, Joel H.

1972 Education and the rise of the corporate state. Boston: Beacon Publishing.

1976 The sorting machine. New York: David MacKay.

Tyack, David B.

1974 The one best system. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Weatherly, Ulysses G.

1980 cited in The Sociology of Race Relations. Thomas Pettigrew ed. New York: The Free Press. P. 3.

Weber, Samuel E.

1905 The charity school movement in colonial Pennsylvania. Philadelphia:

Weinberg, Meyer

1977 A chance to learn. New York: Cambridge University Press.

1977 Minority students: A research appraisal. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; National Institute of Education.

Whyte, William Foote

1976 "Letters" Footnotes, vol. 4, no. 6, p. 8.

Wollenberg, Charles M.

1976 All deliberate speed: Segregation and exclusion in California schools, 1885-1975. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Figure 1

National School Policies Regarding the Education of Minority Group Children and Their Intellectual and Ideological Foundations

National School Policy	Intellectual Foundation	Ideological Foundation
Segregation	Inherent racial superiority/inferiority, natural inequality (conservative/order model)	Separatist
Desegregation	Cultural deprivation, ethnocentricism, progressivism, and professional control (liberal/order model)	Assimilation/integration
Neighborhood schools/ democratic localism	Preservation of ethnic/cultural differences, minority status groups, and community control (radical/conflict model)	Cultural pluralism and Cultural democracy
Voucher system	Accommodation, freedom for assimilation and pluralism and individual control	Individualism and multicultural coexistence